



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Schwab et al.

Serial No.: 09/877,597

Group No.: 2153

Filed: June 8, 2001

Examiner: L. Nash

For: SYSTEM FOR TRANSFERRING DESKTOP COMPUTER CONFIGURATION

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

RECEIVED
SEP 14 2004
Technology Center 2100

In response to the Office Action mailed May 4, 2004, the Examiner's attention is directed to the following remarks.

The claims of this application are being resubmitted in unamended form, on the grounds the Examiner has failed to establish *prima facie* obviousness. All of the claims currently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Lenz ('196) in view of Parulski et al. ('659). Not only does Lenz teach away from Applicants' claims as a primary reference, Parulski et al. is not an analogous art, and there is no justification for the Lenz/Parulski combination. Moreover, even if so combined, Applicants' invention as claimed would not result.

The Examiner states: "Lenz describes a system to automatically configure a client's preferences and settings through a server across a network." Implicit in this remark is the acknowledgement that the control of the configuration process lies at a *remote, centralized location*, rather than with the client. The Examiner's statement further implies that the Lenz system is structured utilizing a "client-server" architecture, which requires the existence of a centrally-located computer serving multiple clients over a specific network.

The Examiner also concedes that "Lenz does not teach the application of a transportable data medium to save user preferences and subsequently transferring those user-defined configurations to other computer systems. Nonetheless, this feature would have been an obvious